



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,044	02/28/2002	Bob Janssen	DVME-1020US	6490

21302 7590 02/27/2006

KNOBLE, YOSHIDA & DUNLEAVY
EIGHT PENN CENTER
SUITE 1350, 1628 JOHN F KENNEDY BLVD
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

LIM, KRISNA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2153

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/087,044	Applicant(s) JANSSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Krisna Lim	Art Unit 2153	

All Participants:

(1) Krisna Lim.

(2) Mr. Kevin Dunleavy (Reg. No. 32,024).

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 February 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☐ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☒ Personal (Copy given to: ☒ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

103 rejection,

Claims discussed:

1-9

Prior art documents discussed:

Fritz (U.S. Patent No. 6,757,679)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Counsel and examiner discussed the invention, the claimed language, the gist of the invention, the teaching of the reference and the newly proposed language to clarify how the applicant's multi-user system dynamically adjust and maintain the maximum number of requests that can simultaneously process. Examiner indicated that this kind of clarify language might require a new search. .